

REMARKS

Independent Claim 1 has been rejected under 35 USC 103 as unpatentable over US 2004/0047348 to O'Neill, US 2003/0212800 to Jones et al, US 2003/0037108 to Peiffer et al, US 5,708,780 to Levergood et al, and US 6,732,176 to Stewart et al. In the Examiner's remarks, there is mention of a reference "Steward". The Applicant assumes that the Examiner meant to refer to Stewart et al. Claims 2-13 are dependent from Claim 1. The Examiner has not cited any additional references against these subclaims.

O'Neill relates to an arrangement in which a mobile terminal in a foreign network is able to be contacted using its home address that it uses in its home network. Nowhere does O'Neill show or suggest:

"associating unique data with an identifier of said client and storing a mapping of said association in said AP",

as specifically set forth in Claim 1. The Examiner has asserted that binding table 933 of O'Neill associates unique data with an identifier of a said client, and that the host home address corresponds with unique data. The Applicant can not agree. The host home address is used by all users of the host and is therefore not unique. It is therefore clear that O'Neill does not affect the patentability of Claim 1.

Jones et al relates to a network in which multiple service providers serve users through a common access network. Nowhere does Jones et al show or suggest:

"associating unique data with an identifier of said client and storing a mapping of said association in said AP",

as specifically set forth in Claim 1. It is therefore clear that Jones et al does not affect the patentability of Claim 1.

Peiffer et al relates to a system for maintaining statefulness without placing cookies on a client device. Rather, the reference places cookies on a server. Nowhere does Peiffer et al show or suggest:

“associating unique data with an identifier of said client and storing a mapping of said association in said AP”,

as specifically set forth in Claim 1. It is therefore clear that Peiffer et al does not affect the patentability of Claim 1.

Levergood et al transmits a service request from a client to a server through a network such as the Internet. Nowhere does Levergood et al show or suggest:

“associating unique data with an identifier of said client and storing a mapping of said association in said AP”,

as specifically recited in Claim 1. It is therefore clear that Levergood et al does not affect the patentability of Claim 1.

Stewart et al relates to a network 130 which has a plurality of access points. Each access point checks with a memory to determine a respective network provider, and a route to that provider. Nowhere does Stewart et al show or suggest:

“associating unique data with an identifier of said client and storing a mapping of said association in said AP”,

as specifically recited in Claim 1. It is therefore clear that Stewart et al, and all of the other references cited against Claim 1, taken either singly or in combination, do not affect the patentability of Claim 1.

Subclaims 2-13 are dependent from Claim 1 and add further advantageous features. The Applicant submits that these subclaims are patentable as their parent Claim 1.

Independent Claim 25 has been rejected under 35 USC 103 as unpatentable over O'Neill and US 2003/0079134 to Manchala et al. O'Neill has been discussed above. Manchala et al relates to a document depository system. Nowhere does Manchala et al show or suggest:

"the AP, in response to a re-directed request to access the network from the client, associates unique data with an identifier of the client and stores a mapping of the association",

as specifically set forth in Claim 25. Nowhere do either O'Neill or Manchala et al. associate unique data with an identifier of the client. It is therefore clear that the patentability of Claim 25 is not affected by the cited references, taken either singly or in combination.

Subclaim 26, which is dependent from Claim 25, has been rejected on the same references as Claim 25. Since Claim 26 is dependent from Claim 25 and adds further advantageous features, the Applicant submits that Claim 26 is patentable as its parent Claim 25.

Subclaim 27 has been additionally rejected on a Jones et al. and Pieffer et al. Both of these references have been discussed above. The Applicant submits that Claim 27 is patentable as its parent Claim 25.

Subclaims 34, 36 and 41 are dependent from Claim 1. The same references which have been applied against Claim 1 have been applied against these subclaims. The Applicant submits that these subclaims are patentable as their parent Claim 1.

Independent Claim 42 has been rejected as unpatentable over Jones et al., US 7,177,839 to Claxton et al and US 2003/0188117 to Yoshino et al. Jones et al has been discussed above.

Claxton et al relates to a system for accomplishing business transactions where a subscriber employs a certifying authority (issuing bank) who certifies a signing party to a relying party's bank for the relying party. Claxton et al does not generate a local digital signature. Rather, Claxton et al regenerates signatures, as explained in column 51, lines 28-30. The Examiner attempts to interpret Claxton et al in view of the instant specification. The Applicant submits that Claxton et al should be interpreted in view of its own specification, not that of the instant specification.

Yoshino et al relates to a single memory which is partitioned for use by different users. The Examiner has pointed to ¶0766 of Yoshino et al to show an association between unique data and a client identifier. However, ¶0766 of Yoshino et al discloses generating a random number, not unique data.

It is therefore clear that none of Jones et al, Claxton et al and Yoshino et al show or suggest:

“receiving a client identifier and unique data;
associating said unique data with said client identifier;
received in a redirected universal resource locator included embedded information;
generating a local digital signature or using said embedded information and said association betweeen said unique data and said client identifier;
comparing said local digital signature with a digital signature received in said embedded information”,

as specifically set forth in Claim 42. It is therefore clear that Jones et al, Claxton et al and Yoshino et al, taken either singly or in combination, do not affect the patentability of Claim 42.

The Examiner has additionally applied US 2005/0114680, to Chinnaswamy et al, to subclaims 43-47. Chinnaswamy et al relates to roaming of a client device between WLAN networks, and authenticating the client device by employing temporary credentials for authentication that provide privacy of the user's identity. Nowhere does Chinnaswamy et al show or suggest:

“receiving a client identifier and unique data;
associating said unique data with said client identifier;
received in a redirected universal resource locator included embedded information;
generating a local digital signature or using said embedded information and said association between said unique data and said client identifier;
comparing said local digital signature with a digital signature received in said embedded information”,

as specifically recited in parent Claim 42. Since subclaims 43-47 are dependent from Claim 42 and add further advantageous features, the Applicant submits that subclaims 43-47 are patentable as their parent Claim 42.

The Examiner has applied Levergood et al and Peiffer et al to Claims 48-57.

Independent Claim 48 claims a method for controlling network access which includes transmitting a client identifier and unique data, and generating a webpage including embedded data. Nowhere does Levergood et al show or suggest this method. Levergood et al transmits a service request from a client to a server through a network such as the Internet. Nowhere does Levergood et al show or suggest:

“generating a web page including embedded data”,

as specifically recited in Claim 48. Rather, Levergood et al gives access to a web page, which webpage does not include embedded data. Levergood et al merely changes the URL of an existing page to a new page name. See column 3, lines 62-65. The Examiner has admitted that Levergood et al does not disclose generating a web page including embedded data. It is therefore clear that Levergood et al does not generate a webpage, and therefore does not affect the patentability of Claim 48.

Peiffer et al has been discussed above. Nowhere does Peiffer et al show or suggest:

“generating a webpage including embedded data”,

as specifically set forth in Claim 48. Rather, Peiffer et al generates a customized web resource based on the user’s past behavior. Nowhere does Peiffer et al generate a webpage including embedded data. It is therefore clear that neither Levergood et al nor Peiffer et al, taken either separately or in combination, affect the patentability of Claim 48.

Subclaims 49 and 50 are dependent from Claim 48 and add further advantageous features. The Applicant submits that these subclaims are patentable as their parent Claim 48.

Similarly, nowhere do either Levergood et al or Peiffer et al show or suggest:

“means for generating a webpage including embedded data”,

as specifically recited in Claim 51, as explained above. It is therefore clear that the patentability of Claim 51 is not affected by Levergood et al and Peiffer et al, taken either singly or in combination.

Subclaims 52 and 53 are dependent from Claim 51 and add further advantageous features. The Applicant submits that these subclaims are patentable as their parent Claim 51.

Similarly, nowhere does Levergood et al show or suggest:

“transmitting authentication input page requesting authentication information”,

as specifically set forth in Claim 54. Rather, as explained above, Levergood et al does not transmit an authentication input page requesting authentication information, but rather gives access to a web page. It is therefore clear that the patentability of Claim 54 is not affected by Levergood et al and Peiffer et al, taken either singly or in combination.

Subclaim 55 is dependent from Claim 54 and adds further advantageous features. The Applicant submits that Claim 55 is patentable as its parent Claim 54.

Similarly, nowhere does Levergood et al show or suggest:

“means for transmitting authentication input page requesting authentication information”,

as specifically recited in Claim 56. As explained above, Levergood et al does not transmit an authentication input page, but rather gives access to a web page. It is therefore clear that the patentability of Claim 56 is not affected by Levergood et al and Peiffer et al, taken either singly or in combination.

Subclaim 57 is dependent from Claim 56 and adds further advantageous features. The Appellant submits that Claim 57 is patentable as its parent Claim 56.

CUSTOMER NO.: 24498
Ser. No. 10/566,393
Date of Rejection: 24 June 2010
Response dated: 18 November 2010

PATENT
PU030228

The Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter in Claims 28-33. The Applicant submits that Claims 1-13, 25-27, 34, 36, and 41-57 are allowable as well.

The Applicant submits that the Application is now in condition for allowance. A notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

The Applicant believes that this paper has incurred no fee other than the fee for a petition for an extension of the period for response. However, if such a fee has been incurred, the Applicant requests that such fee be charged to Deposit Account No. 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,
JUNBIAO ZHANG

by: _____/Catherine A. Cooper/_____
Catherine A. Cooper, Attorney
Reg. No. 40,877
(609) 734-6440

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing LLC
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312
November 18, 2010